

## AB 982 Public Advisory Group

Meeting Held June 16, 2000  
Hearing Room, State Water Resources Control Board  
Sacramento, California

### Meeting Summary

June 16, 2000

**Welcome and Convene Meeting:** Co-chair Craig Johns convened the meeting at 9:15 a.m. and declared a quorum. Members were asked to introduce themselves.

**Proxies:** In the event votes needed to be taken, proxies were submitted for Bob Caustin, Mark Rentz, Pat Blacklock and Jim Noyes. (In fact, no votes were taken during the meeting and therefore no proxies were used.)

**Groundrules:** For the benefit of members who didn't attend the May meeting, Steve Ekstrom (facilitator) pointed to the groundrules adopted by Public Advisory Group (PAG). A member also reminded everyone that PAG had agreed in May to use caucuses on an as needed basis.

**July meeting:** Information on dates and location of the July meeting was presented. The meeting will be held on July 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> at the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts Office, 1955 Workman Mill Road, Whittier, California. For more logistics information members should contact Gita Kapahi (916/657-0883).

**Summary of May 4-5, 2000 meeting:** The summary was approved by consensus.

**Draft Proposal for a Comprehensive Surface Water Quality Monitoring Program:** Craig J. Wilson summarized the draft proposal, noting that most of PAG's consensus items were incorporated in the document. The proposal, which is designed to give Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) a framework, has two foci: (1) documentation of general ambient water quality conditions in clean and polluted areas, and (2) identification of specific problems in targeted watersheds. The proposal is not based on a specific budget, and can be scaled up or down in proportion to available resources.

Several members questioned the proposed "probability-based approach" mentioned in items 6 and 7 on page 13, indicating that it was appropriate for large waters such as bays, estuaries or the ocean, but not appropriate for inland waterways. After much discussion it was agreed that members with concerns on this, or other matters in the proposal, should submit written comments to Craig Wilson by June 30. Craig will rewrite the proposal based on members' input where appropriate and return the next draft to PAG by July 7 in the packet for the July 13-14 meeting. The PAG agreed to waive the 10-day notification

rule in this instance. Additionally, Dave Paradies will email to all members a description of various approaches for monitoring water quality in inland waterways. Other members with relevant information on monitoring that they'd like to share with the PAG are also encouraged to use email to circulate such information.

**Scientific Review of the Draft Proposal for a Comprehensive Surface Water Quality Monitoring Program:** Craig Wilson stated that the original plan called for the formation of a standing committee, but that this would be difficult to support with limited staff resources. Instead he proposed a one-time workshop, a large group meeting of scientists who could advise on the scientific merits or problems inherent in the draft proposal. Wilson indicated the possibility that the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) could pay for travel for some participants. Further, he suggested the meeting be held after the July PAG meeting.

Members expressed support for not forming a standing committee but expressed concerns about the design of the meeting (it shouldn't employ a standard testimonial-based approach), and the possibility that a one time meeting could be too superficial. Following much discussion it was agreed to hold caucuses so that environmental and regulated community representatives could clarify their positions. After the caucus break, and following more discussion, the following was agreed to by consensus:

- It will be a one day workshop.
- There will be time for substantial review periods by scientists and PAG before and after the workshop.
- Regulated and environmental community representatives on PAG will nominate up to six scientists each and will submit these names to Craig Wilson by June 30.
- Craig Wilson will examine the list, look for "holes" or gaps in knowledge/experience, and based on this examination recommend other names.
- The meeting of scientists will be held on August 10 in northern California (time and specific location to be determined) and will precede the PAG meeting which will be moved from August 10 to August 11.
- After PAG members have commented on the current monitoring draft proposal (by 6/30) Craig Wilson will revise the draft as appropriate and circulate it to PAG and scientists by July 7.

**Review of Consensus Points and Issues:** No PAG members asked to review any of the items arrived at by consensus or vote from previous meetings.

**Continued Discussion of Issues Related to Total Maximum Daily Loads:** Linda Sheehan began the discussion by asking that staff prepare a document describing the SWRCB's current TMDL program, so that PAG members would have something to react

to. Craig Wilson agreed to see that such a document is prepared and will have it available for the July meeting. However, Wilson indicated it may not be possible to have it ready for the July mailing in which case it would be handed out at the meeting.

Members agreed to address several topics suggested by environmental community representatives: (1) funding; (2) who should develop TMDLs?; (3) peer review; and (4) integrating TMDL and other water quality efforts. After significant dialogue, the following were agreed to by consensus:

1. The PAG encourages the RWQCBs to consider TMDL development when approving Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs) not otherwise legally required of dischargers.
2. The SWRCB and RWQCBs should allocate adequate resources and staff positions to develop and maintain appropriate TMDL expertise in-house.
3. The SWRCB should establish an integrated, complementary and not conflicting approach to implement the State's Section 303(d) responsibilities and to attain water quality standards.

NOTE: Members agreed that item 3 above was a broad statement and that they need to consider more specific issues (e.g., coordination with other Boards such as the Air Resources Board) at a later meeting. Also, members agreed to address the peer review topic at a later meeting.

**Public Forum:** Members of the public were asked to comment. None chose to do so.

**Adjourn:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m..